

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 have been amended. Claims 6-9 have been added. Claims 1-9 are pending. In view of the above amendments and remarks below, the Applicant requests allowance of all claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 112

The Office action rejected claims 1-4 as indefinite because it was unclear which direction is “lower” and which direction is “upper” as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the positioning of the mold layers in the mold portion. The amended claim deletes the reference to “upper” and “lower” and recites that “a first surface of a first mold layer is adhered to the lamp body and a second mold layer is laminated to a second surface of the first mold layer, which is opposite the first surface.” Such a structure is illustrated in FIG. 1 and described in the specification at page 6, second and third paragraphs. No new matter has been added.

Claims 2-4 have been amended to conform to the mold layer nomenclature of claim 1.

The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection of claims 1-4.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1 and 5 were rejected as anticipated by JP 04075444A (Morimoto). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Morimoto discloses that a sealing resin (33) is injected into a recess (28) and a rubber packing (30) is pushed into the recess (28). The rubber packing (30) serves as a piston when pushed in and causes the sealing resin to intrude into a gap between the insertion hole (24) and the cord (23) to establish a seal. See “Construction” and FIGS. 1A, 1B. The sealing of the lamp cord insertion hole is formed by a rubber packing pushed onto a sealing resin.

In contrast, the present application recites in claims 1 and 5 that a resin mold portion (9) is comprised of two resin layers (9a, 9b) not a resin layer and a rubber packing as in Morimoto.

The second resin layer (9b) is laminated on the first layer (9a). *See, for example*, page 6, second paragraph and FIG. 1. Neither layer is pushed into the cylindrical outer wall as in Morimoto.

Hence, claims 1 and 5 are not anticipated and should be allowable because Moritomo does not disclose every limitation recited in either claim 1 or claim 5 of the present application.

Claim 1 also was rejected as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,972,303 (Machida et al.). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

First, the basis of the rejection is not clear. On page 3, the Office action asserts that element (24a) is "a cord insertion hole." On page 4, element (24a) is referred to as "an upper mold layer laminated over a lower mold layer." These descriptions seem irreconcilable. It is also not clear what the Examiner meant when the Applicant examined the figures and description of Machida. *See, for example*, col. 3, line 60-61 and FIG. 5.

However, after considering the reference, the Applicant notes that Machida et al. discloses that an electric cord (25) passes through a rubber bush (26). The rubber bush (26) is secured to the peripheral wall (24a) of the outlet hole (24) by a bonding agent, which acts to seal the space (20). Col. 3, line 63 to col. 4 line 3 and FIG. 5.

In contrast, as described above, claim 1 of the present application recites a resin mold portion (9) is comprised of two resin layers (9a, 9b), not a rubber bush bonded to the peripheral wall as disclosed in Machida et al.

Hence, claim 1 is not anticipated and should be allowable because Machida et al. does not disclose every limitation recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-4 are dependent from claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection of claims 1-5.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Morimoto or Machida et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,686,156 (Matsui et al.). Claim 4 was rejected as allegedly unpatentable over either Moritomo or Machida et al.

As described above, independent claim 1 recites limitations that are not suggested by Morimoto or Machida et al. In particular, claim 1 recites a resin mold portion having a first mold layer and a second mold layer laminated on the first mold layer. Nor does Matsui suggest those limitations. Claims 2-4 incorporate the limitations recited in claim 1 and, thus, are not suggested by any of those references, taken alone or in combination.

Morimoto either alone or in combination with the cited references neither teaches or suggests having a resin mold comprised of two resin layers laminated together to seal a cord insertion hole in a lamp body. Indeed, Morimoto teaches away from using two resin layers by suggesting the use of a rubber packing on a resin layer. Machida et al. does not even suggest the use of a single resin layer. Instead, Machida et al. teaches bonding a rubber bush to seal a cord insertion hole.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection of claims 2-4.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all claims.

The prior art made of record but not relied upon has not been discussed because those references did not form the basis for rejecting any claims of the present application.